THE

UNITARIAN.

No. 5. May, 1846. Vol. I.

WAR AND PEACE, WITH REFERENCE TO THE PRESENT TIME.

The discussion of the subject of the anti-Christianity of War in the *abstract* has so frequently and successfully engaged the pens of benevolent and philanthropic writers, to say nothing of the long-continued and strenuous labours of *Peace Societies*, that scarcely any arguments remain to be added to this specific treatment of the question. Ably as most of these writers have handled the matter in this particular respect, they have seldom or never, that we know of, treated the subject in the *concrete*, or taken that practical view of it, which, bringing into account the present state of mankind, as distributed over the globe in a mixed, or civilized and barbarous condition, the peculiar relation of those two conditions, or even those subsisting between neighbouring or remote civilized states —together with a variety of other circumstances, political and moral, bearing a close affinity with these considerations—would have gone far, at least, to satisfy the reader that War was unjustifiable at all times, and in every respect and form. We should apprehend that there exists no *Christian* at the present day who requires to be told that the dispensation of the Gospel was and is a dispensation of Peace; that there is scarcely a chapter in the New Testament that does not *virtually* condemn War, and breathe the spirit of forgiveness and good-will. All must admit this, but then the questions suggest themselves: Are all the world Christians? Is Christianity matured? and if not, is a Christian nation meanwhile to submit to be subjugated by barbarians? We know the sort of reply that may be given to these queries; but it

should be borne in mind by the respondents, that, without miraculous interposition, supposing governments to act on their view of the question, cases might and probably would occur of such subjugation. Are they prepared to advocate universal and unconditional Peace on such a position, and at such a risk? If not, it must be admitted that occasions may arise in which the alternative is presented of either a national subjugation or a war of defence.

It is universally admitted, that a community may employ force to repress the rapacity and violence of its own citizens, to disarm and restrain its internal foes; and on what ground can we deny to it the right of repelling the inroads and aggressions of a foreign power? If a government may not lawfully resist a foreign army, invading its territory to desolate and subdue, on what principles can we justify a resistance of a combination of its own citizens for the same injurious purpose? Government is instituted for the very purpose of protecting the community from all violence, no matter by what hands it may be offered; and rulers would be unfaithful to their trust, were they to abandon the rights, interests, and improvements of society to unprincipled rapacity, whether of domestic or foreign foes.

We are told, indeed, that the language of Scripture is, "resist not evil." But the Scriptures are given to us as reasonable beings. We must remember, that to the renunciation of reason in the interpretation of Scripture, we owe those absurdities which have sunk Christianity almost to the level of heathenism. If the precept to "resist not evil" admit no exception, then civil government is prostrated; then the magistrate must, in no case, resist the injurious; then the subject must, in no case, employ the aid of the law to enforce his rights. Why, the very end and office of government is, to *resist* evil men. But what says Dr. Channing on this subject? He commences the concluding part of his essay on "*War*" in these words:

Still I may be asked, whether a people, however forbearing, may not sometimes owe it to its own dignity and safety to engage in War? I answer, yes. When the spirit of justice, humanity, and forbearance, instead of spreading Peace, provokes fresh outrage, this outrage must be met and repressed by force. I know that many sincere Christians oppose to this doctrine the precept of Christ, "resist not evil." But

Christianity is wronged, and its truth exposed to strong objections, when these and the like precepts are literally construed. The whole legislation of Christ is intended to teach us the spirit from which we should act, not to lay down rules for outward conduct. The precept, "resist not evil," if practised to the letter, would annihilate all government in the family and the state; for it is the great work of government to resist evil passions and evil deeds. It is indeed our duty, as Christians, to love our worst enemy, and to desire his true good; but we are to love not only our enemy, but our families, friends, and country, and to take a wise care of our own rights and happiness; and when we abandon to the violence of a wrong-doer these fellow beings and these rights, commended by God to our love and care, we are plainly wanting in that expanded benevolence which Christianity demands. * * * An injury inflicted by one nation on another, may manifest a lawless, hostile spirit, from which, if unresisted, future and increasing outrages are to be feared, which would embolden other communities in wrong-doing, and against which neither property, nor life, nor liberty, would be secure. To protect a state from this spirit of violence and unprincipled aggression, is the duty of rulers; and protection may be found only in War. Here is the legitimate occasion and the true end of an appeal to arms.

These observations are elicited from us after the perusal of two or three lately published tracts and pamphlets on this topic, all of which advocate the extreme doctrine of the abolition of War under all circumstances and in every form, *defensive* as well as *offensive*. Whether such extreme views are calculated to have much weight in the present disturbed state of the public mind with respect to the question of the Oregon territory, or our actual position in India, we will not undertake to say: we are, nevertheless, most anxious for a pacific termination of the dispute in the former case, as well as a speedy settlement of our Indian affairs on terms which may preclude the necessity of further bloodshed.

There is no right-minded Christian, we think, that will not most deeply lament the necessity, if it did exist, for those terrific scenes of slaughter which have taken place on the banks of the Sutlej, and that will not be stimulated thereby to prevent, as much as in him lies, the recurrence of similar scenes, either in that or any other quarter of the globe. Sincerely, however, as we deplore the event and its inevitable results, and deeply as we sympathise with those who have suffered the loss of relations or friends in the conflict, we confess we do not see how it could have been avoided except in the alternative of the eventual surrender of our Indian possessions. Are the extreme advocates of "*Peace under all circumstances*" prepared to give up those possessions, together with the

commercial and other advantages arising therefrom? Perhaps they may be inclined to reply in the affirmative, rather than that such desolating scenes should be re-enacted; but in this many important considerations are involved, such as, whether, as a Christian nation, we should now be justified in resigning our property in, and withdrawing our influence from those regions, where, it will not be denied, our civilisation has operated, on the whole, most beneficially, by spreading not only a knowledge and an appreciation of our political institutions, but, also, in a manner, the benign lights and influences of the Christian religion.

Leaving, however, for the present, the particular bearing of the subject, we will here remark, that of all the writers on "War" whom we have read, Doctor Channing appears to have treated it the most lucidly and rationally. He does not, like our late pious, well-intentioned, and conscientious friend, Mr. Thrush, and some other authors, as above, attribute the causes of modern warfare in its *offensive* phase, almost wholly to the ambition of princes, though it is undoubtedly true that in former times War had its origin very largely in that source. In a discourse not published, we believe, in the late collections of his works,* he says:

> It is indeed true that the ambition of rulers is a frequent cause of War. The desire of building up their power at home, or of extending their empire abroad; of surpassing other Sovereigns, their natural and only rivals; of signalizing their administration by brilliant deeds; and of attracting louder applause than ordinarily attends on pacific virtues; this aspiring principle has in all ages thrown the world into tumult. *But the ambition of rulers does not lie at the root of War. We must remember that ambition is directed and inflamed by public opinion. Were there there not a propensity in the mass of men to give honour to warlike triumphs, rulers would never seek distinction in this bloody career.* The deepest and most operative causes of War are to be found in the universal principles of human nature, in passions which sway all classes of men.

The dispassionate inquirer, looking abroad, at the present moment, at the aspect of public feeling and opinion in the "old world and the new," will, we think, be particularly struck with the verification of this remark of the far-seeing Channing. The military spirit so

* See a "*Sermon on War, delivered before the Convention of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts, May 30th,* 1816," and published at the request of the officers of the Peace Society of Massachusetts. Boston: 1816. Pp. 14, 15.

observable among our neighbours the French as a nation, is at the present time so far from being fanned by the encouragement of royalty, that its overt demonstrations, as is well known, are checked and kept down by the more prudent and pacific counsels of their ruler. If we look, too, beyond the Atlantic, we see a similar spirit prevailing among a great portion of the Democratic party, though happily, we trust, likely to be over-ruled by the more considerate and Christian sections of the American people.

The old leaven of War is therefore not yet extinct, even among civilized nations. Still, the tendencies of civilization are decidedly towards Peace; the influences of progressive knowledge, refinement, arts, and national wealth, are pacific. The old motives for War are losing power; and herein are encouragements to labour in the cause of Peace.

The causes of War, both alleged and real, have been so often descanted upon, and their unchristian character and origin so well indicated, that we need not dwell further on that subject in this place. To counteract those causes, one writer prescribes one method and another another. Perhaps the further extension of the lights of Christian civilization, induced by the lapse of time, and increased international communications, brought about by the necessary operations of commerce, will be the main instruments in removing what remains of the bellicose spirit in nations. We cannot, however, omit to recommend one powerful agency in this blessed work, additional to that which we are gratified in witnessing almost daily as sending forth its earnest and pacific appeals and remonstrances in the columns of the more respectable part of the public press of this country. In the spirit, and nearly in the words of the talented and pious writer to whom we have have just alluded, we say, let Christian ministers exhibit with greater clearness and distinctness, than ever they have done, the pacific and benevolent spirit of Christianity. This spirit ought to hold the same place in their preaching, which it holds in the Gospel of our Lord. Instead of being crowded and lost among other subjects, it should stand in the front of Christian graces; it should be inculcated as the life and essence of our religion. They should teach men that

charity is greater than faith and hope; that God is love or benevolence; and that love is the brightest communication of Divinity to the human soul. They should teach men that it is the property of the benevolence of Christianity, to diffuse itself like the light and rain of heaven—to disdain the limits of rivers, mountains, or oceans, by which nations are divided, and to embrace every human being as a brother. Let them never forget, that their preaching is evangelical just in proportion as it inculcates and awakens this disinterested and unbounded charity; that their hearers are Christians, just as far and no farther, than they delight in peace and beneficence.

It is a painful truth that the pacific influence of the Gospel has been greatly obstructed by the disposition which has prevailed in all ages, and especially among Christian ministers, to give importance to the peculiarities of sects, and to rear walls of partition between different denominations. Under no religion have intolerance and persecution raged more fiercely, than under the Gospel of the meek and forbearing Saviour. Christians have made the earth to reek with blood and to resound with denunciation. Can we wonder, that while the spirit of War has been cherished in the very bosom of the church, it has continued to ravage among the nations. Let it be remembered that Christianity is a spirit rather than a doctrine, and that this spirit is universal love; and let perpetual testimony be borne to this great characteristic of the Gospel. No doubt that were the true spirit of Christianity to be inculcated with but half the zeal which has been wasted on doubtful and disputed doctrines, a sympathy, a co-operation, might in a very short time be produced among Christians of every nation, most propitious to the pacification of the world. In consequence of the progress of knowledge and the extension of commerce, Christians of both hemispheres are at this moment brought nearer to one another than at any former period; and an intercourse founded on religious sympathies is gradually connecting the most distant regions. What a powerful weapon is furnished by this new bond of union to the ministers and friends of Peace! Once let Christians of every nation be brought to espouse the cause of Peace with one heart and one voice, and their labour will not be in vain. Human affairs will rapidly

assume a new and milder aspect. Public opinion will be purified. The false lustre of the hero will grow dim; a nobler order of character will be admired and diffused; the kingdoms of the world will gradually become the kingdoms of God and of his Christ.

While we are willing to believe that Christians of different nations and tongues are uniting their efforts in support of that cause which, by its sublimity and purity, obscures, and almost annihilates those perishable interests about which states are divided,—we cannot close our eyes to the fact that the prevalent desire for the maintenance of peace between this country and America, at the present juncture, appears to be based upon grounds somewhat questionable compared with those above indicated, with which, however, we are not disposed to quarrel, inasmuch as, in the ordering of Providence, they are in themselves of most beneficial tendency. Go into what part of the country we will, fall into what company we may, the same reasons are adduced why we should not go to War with America. In general, religious grounds seem to be put aside, and commercial grounds to be substituted. Whether this argues an improvement in the state of human society, or of its moral feeling, we will not stop to discuss. There are various degrees of goodness in motives; and if we cannot get the very purest, let us not cast aside those that are, at least, *good*, or rather not *bad*, in themselves.

We read in the *Times* of the 6th of April, that on the 27th ult. there appeared a "Response from Plymouth in New England, to Plymouth in this country, the tenour of which was the maintenance of peaceful relations between England and the United States." We are, moreover, informed that this document is but one manifestation of a great movement for the preservation of Peace, which is now going on both east and west of the Atlantic, and which seems to be growing daily in importance, having been called into visible existence by the threatening aspect of affairs on the subject of the Oregon question; that the movement originated in a member of the Society of Friends, at Manchester, who wrote an appeal to the *merchants* of Lancashire, urging them to transmit a "friendly address" to the *merchants* of the United States. This appeal was afterwards modified, so as to be made appli-

cable to the *merchants* of Great Britain generally. The following "Recommendation" was accordingly drawn up, and signed by several leading names :—

A suggestion having been made by a few advocates of the cause of Peace that friendly addresses *from merchants, and the various other classes of the community in this country, to corresponding classes of the community in America, as fellow-citizens of the world, mutually dependent the one upon the other, and therefore mutually interested in averting War,* might be very seasonable ; that they might prove as oil thrown on the troubled waters of discord, and at the present juncture exert a salutary influence on the public mind, in both nations ; it is proposed that brief addresses should accordingly be transmitted to our American brethren, deprecating so dire a calamity as War, and contrasting with it the untold blessings of Peace, *referring to the dependence of commerce on peace,* urging national arbitration, for the adjustment of national disputes, acknowledging our mutual dependence, and the direct dependence of us all on the bountiful providence of Him, who *having made the sea as a highway for the nations, and the "trade-wind" as a wafting power, has, in His goodness thus designed that the varied products of the varying climes of the earth should be freely borne by the winds of Heaven upon the waters of the deep, from the shores of one nation to the shores of another.*

This "Recommendation," dated December 29th, 1845, and the "Appeal to British Merchants," were transmitted to Elihu Burrit, well known as the learned Blacksmith of America, who made them into one of his so-called "olive leaves," and wrote an appeal to the clergy of all denominations in both countries, urging them to forward the cause of Peace. Since that period the "Recommendation," has been signed by hundreds in this country, including some of the nobility and other influential members of the Anti-Corn-law League, together with several of the most eminent and strenuous advocates of the sacred cause of Temperance and Peace.

The Address from Plymouth, Old England, to Plymouth, Massachusetts, is as follows :—

Friendly Appeal from the Inhabitants of Plymouth, Great Britain, to the Citizens of the United States of America, for the purpose of averting War between the two countries.

To the Legislators and Citizens of the United States of America.*

Friends and Brethren—We are deeply concerned to perceive that there are any indications, how remote soever, of threatened hostility between your country and our own. Towards your nation we entertain, in common with the vast majority of our fellow-subjects, feelings of sincere good-will. As the friends of Peace throughout the world, we

* We give this address as we find it described ; but we must confess we cannot discern why it should be called an address from Plymouth in England to Plymouth in America in particular, and not rather an address to American citizens generally.—Ed.

desire that all those who delight in War may be scattered ; but with you, to whom we are allied by community of national origin, by identity of language, by similarity in many of our laws and institutions, we earnestly and especially deprecate hostility. Moreover, by War our commercial intercourse would be seriously impeded, the progress of civilization and of science be obstructed, immense pecuniary loss be incurred, domestic ties be broken, humanity be outraged, life to a fearful extent be sacrificed, and dire offence committed against the laws of our beneficent Creator. By War we must both lose much ; and what would the victor gain that would be worth one-thousandth part of the cost of the conflict ?

Again, whatever be the value of the Oregon territory, it would be a poor compensation to the owner for the blood and treasure which would be spent in acquiring it ; and then, too, the dispute respecting it may so easily be settled by arbitration, if other and simpler means be ineffectual.

Let us, we entreat you, agree to exert all our influence, personal and political, on each side of the Atlantic, to frustrate the devices of those ambitious and reckless spirits, in either country, who, by precipitating us into conflict, would render us the scorn of the world; while the energies and influence of two great nations, which ought to be combined for the benefit of the entire human race, would be foolishly and wickedly employed in inflicting mutual and widely-spread injury and destruction.

Allow us, then, to hope that your cordial response to this appeal may strengthen the bonds of amity between us, and promote the interests of universal peace.

Dated, Jan. 27th, 1846.

(Signed by several hundreds of the inhabitants of Plymouth, headed by the mayor, and six borough and county magistrates, and two clergymen of the Establishment.)

The address from Boston in England to Boston in America, contains, among others, the following excellent remarks :—

We believe War to be an evil—a pure evil, unattended by any good in its motives, actions, or results—an evil so tremendous that no earthly consideration can justify it.

We are convinced that War is destructive to all the interests of humanity, to happiness and liberty, to commerce and wealth, to science, arts, and civilization, to learning and intelligence, to philanthropy and religion.

We regard War as unreasonable; for even should it prove which party had the most strength, it would never show on which side was the most right; and we doubt not that any good which may in some cases be supposed to have resulted from fighting, could have been secured in a greater degree, more rapidly, more effectually, more widely, more permanently, and far more cheaply, by negotiation.

We consider War to be condemned alike by the voice of conscience and experience, by natural and revealed religion; and to be unworthy of the nature of man, and contrary to the will of God. We therefore protest against our being called out to fight either against you or any other portion of the one family of man," &c.

The spirit in which these addresses were met by the people of America may be gathered from the following admirable response from the merchants and other inha-

bitants of the city of New York, a copy of which appeared in the New York *Journal of Commerce* :—

To the Friends of Peace throughout the British Realm, and especially those in Manchester, Boston, Huddersfield, Plymouth, and other places, who have issued "Friendly Addresses" to the People of the United States.

The undersigned merchants and other inhabitants of the city of New York, earnestly desiring the preservation of Peace between the two countries, are the more encouraged to expect it when they find the hearts of so many in the Fatherland beating in unison with their own. No triumphs of brute force over moral right ever did or can command our admiration as do those peaceful overtures, coming from a nation so powerful as England, and so well prepared for a conflict of arms ; and none, we are sure, were ever so approved by the Prince of Peace. The effect of these "Friendly Addresses" upon the public mind in this country will be eminently favourable, and will do much to promote that hearty good-will which ought ever to prevail between nations bound together by so many sacred ties. Go on, then, respected friends, in your labour of love and mercy. Tell your people that our noisiest men are not the best exponents of the national sentiment towards Great Britain, or in regard to War. Tell them that in the nation at large there is a vast aggregate of moral worth, which, when called into action, as it is beginning to be, by the threatened calamities of a causeless and unnecessary War, will assuredly repress ambition, or turn it into a more peaceful channel. Tell them that this effect is already visible to a most gratifying extent, not only in our maritime cities, but throughout the land ; and that it has been aided by the relaxation of the restrictive features of your commercial policy.

A War of concession, compromise, mutual forbearance, and good fellowship, resulting, as they necessarily must, in increasing trade, intellectual advancement, and progress in everything truly great and good, is the only War which we wish to see waged between the two nations.

As to Oregon, although from comparative proximity we naturally desire our proper share of that extensive territory, yet we will gladly concur (and we believe such is the general voice of the nation) in any fair measures of compromise or reference, which the two Governments may see fit to adopt, for the peaceable adjustment of the question. It is clearly one which ought not, under any circumstances, to breed a War between the two countries ; and we hold, that without the most deplorable obstinacy and the blackest guilt on the part of one or both of the claimants, such an issue is impossible. As a matter of profit and loss, it would be infinitely better that the whole of Oregon should be sunk to the bottom of the ocean, than that two such nations as Great Britain and the United States should go to War about it, to the disgrace of civilization, Christianity, and rational freedom.

With a firm belief in the pacific disposition of both Governments, and that they will yet be enabled to settle the controversy in a manner at once just and honourable to all concerned, we look forward with hope to the future, and in the meantime beg leave to subscribe ourselves your friends and well-wishers.

THE "QUARTERLY REVIEW" ON MR. NEWMAN'S "DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE."

To the Editor of the "Unitarian."

DEAR SIR,—In the last number of the *Quarterly Review*, I have been reading a very long and elaborate article on Mr. Newman's work, entitled, "An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine." In that article there is a passage, which, while it contains a statement deprecatory of Unitarianism, propounds an opinion concerning the worship of the Virgin, that, I conceive, not only tends to neutralise the force of the reviewer's previous remarks, but may serve as a valid argument for the Unitarian to employ against the doctrine of a Trinity. But before I submit this passage to your notice, I have a few general observations to make, and one or two on the style and manner of the article itself.

Free from the spirit of Sectarianism, I am accustomed to read, as far as my means and leisure will permit, the leading publications of all parties; and I look upon the *Quarterly* among reviews, much in the same light as we are accustomed to regard the *Times* among newspapers. For years I have derived much instruction and profit, as well as pleasure, from the pages of the *Quarterly Review*, more particularly from its literary, scientific, and historical papers. Its theology, I must confess, I never did thoroughly comprehend. Perhaps, however, that may have arisen from my own want of understanding. Be that as it may, I do profess to have some notions with regard to grammar and style; and, in this respect, as in some others, the *Quarterly*, as every one knows, lays claim to the office of an *arbiter elegantiarum*. Its circulation is very extensive, especially among the higher, more polished, and better educated classes of society; and hence the greater need there is, that its style should be grammatical, elegant, and classical, without dispensing with the more taking qualities, where occasion requires them, of brilliancy and sprightliness.

Moreover, in treating abstruse subjects of theology, perspicuity and precision are indispensably requisite. Yet it is in this respect that the theological writers in the *Quarterly* are signally deficient; they are sometimes not even grammatical, as I shall presently show. And this is the more surprising when it is considered that these writers are undoubtedly ecclesiastics, brought up at the Universities, probably masters of colleges, and moving in the highest circles of literature and science. They manifest, indeed, great profundity of research, deep study, and much labour of thought, but a wonderful inaptitude in conveying to their readers any exact notion

of the precise object and result of their speculations.* For instance, the author of the paper on Mr. Newman's book shows that he possesses—

"Great store of learned lumber in his head;"

but how to render his knowledge intelligible to others,

"In this the task and mighty labour lies."

Parenthesis within parenthesis, dash after dash, the nominative case frequently separated from its verb by a dozen lines or more, a nominative without any verb, and a verb without any nominative, involutions and tortuosities at which Addison and Swift, and even Johnson would have stood aghast—erroneous collocations of words, pet qualifying phrases, such as "*at least*" repeated several times in *a page*—these are but a few of the graces of style with which the author of the article in question condescends to treat his readers. What would be the fate of a school-boy were he to show up a theme commencing with such language as the following, which begins a paragraph in this review where the opening noun is found without either government or concord?

Mr. Newman, as, notwithstanding, his own warning *he* has revived the arguments of Petavius, *so he* has not feared to tread in the steps of the Father of the Oratory. He is even more prodigal in his concession.—415.

[*More prodigal than whom, Petavius or Father Simon?*]

Again:—

What is wanted throughout—what is absolutely necessary, is the proof that *those tenets* of Mediæval Christianity, *which* were undeveloped till a much later period, *which* were unknown, or *which* even Mr. Newman despairs of proving to have been known in primitive and Apostolic times, all *which* he *describes himself* "as an addition upon the Articles of the Creed," *which* he elsewhere calls the Supplement to Scriptural or Apostolic Christianity—*the question is whether these* (*i e.* the *tenets*, which now stands without a verb), are essential and integral parts of Christianity, to be imposed upon all Christendom on the penalty of anathema, of exclusion from the church, and in consequence (according to the inflexible theory) irremediably from eternal life.—p. 421.

What can the writer mean by the development of undeveloped and dormant Christianity? If he means what he says he means, why make use of an unintelligible expression to be immediately qualified and explained by another supposed to be intelligible? Here is the paragraph:—

---

* Without meaning to detract from the learning or piety of our ecclesiastical dignitaries, we cannot but bear testimony to the justness of our Correspondent's remarks, when we remember the *style* of an episcopal charge which appeared in the public papers some few months ago, and which elicited at the time some very pungent animadversions from the *Times*.—Ed.

We, too, as has been said, have our theory of development. For us Mr. Newman goes too far, and not far enough. We believe that the development of Christianity, *of the yet undeveloped or dormant part of Christianity*, since the Reformation, has been immense; the development, we mean, *of its morality, of its social influence, of its humanity.*—p. 459.

So, then, the morality of Christianity, its social influence, and its humanity, are the undeveloped or dormant part of Christianity, and yet their development, since the Reformation, has been immense!!

But I will not detain you any longer from the passage which principally induced me to trouble you with this communication; like others, it is not free from inaccuracies of style:—

We are persuaded that the New Testament is *not merely* the sole authority for the eternal and immutable great Christian truths, as they were revealed by our Lord and His Apostles, and received in the first ages, *but for* their relative importance in the scheme of salvation. All is in exquisite and finished unison. Strike one chord too strongly, dwell too long on one note, and you destroy the harmony. *All religious error* (we emphatically repeat, *religious* error) is *an exaggeration of some Christian truth*, with a necessary depression or obscuration of other Christian truths. Calvinism is an exaggeration of God's sovereignty, to the utter extinction of human free will; *Unitarianism is an exaggeration of the unity of God; in its Socinian form an exaggeration of the moral to the depression of the mysterious, we may say, perhaps, the transcendental element.* So Mediæval Christianity is a gradual exaggeration of many true principles; it is an undue elevation of that which is mutable above that which is eternal; of that which is subordinate above that which is primal and essential; of that which is accessory and in some degree foreign, obscure, doubtful—*at least*—for that which is the everlasting Gospel; of form above spirit, of that which shall pass away, above that which shall never pass away.

Granting, for instance, that the most profound reverence *would be* [Qy. *is*] inferentially enjoined by the simple fact, that the Virgin was so honoured of God as to become the mother of His incarnate Son. Elevate that reverence into adoration, and will it any longer retain any due proportion? *Is it possible that two worships can be thus coincident, and the one not become dominant over the other, in proportion to the popular feeling, and the manifest, the visible effect watched and fostered, perhaps at first from pure devotional feelings, by an ignorant priesthood?*—p. 455

In the first place, will it not strike the most indifferent observer of theological differences, that the position sought to be established by this paragraph, is erroneous? that *all religious* error does not consist in an "exaggeration of some Christian truth?"—that much of it is occasioned by palpable misconception and perversion of the spirit and letter of the Divine records? I will not descend to particulars in the compass of a brief letter like this, but I think many of your intelligent readers will be able to bear me out in this assertion.

But, "Unitarianism is an exaggeration of the Unity of God!" Now, if the Unity of God be a *truth*, it cannot be exaggerated. It

may be often repeated, much dwelt upon, mainly enforced by those who hold the doctrine as being the basis, the essential, fundamental tenet of their whole system, but "exaggerated," surely, it cannot be. You cannot make the foundation of an edifice too secure, or too strong.

Moreover, if the coincidence of *two* worships is likely to have the tendency so justly described by the reviewer, what shall be said when the object of adoration is tripartite? Is not one of the three, *a fortiori*, likely to "become dominant over the others, in proportion to the popular feeling?" Experience proves that it is: in neither case, however, unfortunately, as we humbly conceive, does the "popular feeling" centre upon the right object. Hence the great and paramount necessity that the worship of the one true and only God should be held up continually to the "popular" view, and enforced on the "popular" apprehension.

I am, respectfully, &c., SENEX.

April 4, 1846.

POLITICAL PIETY,

AS EXEMPLIFIED IN THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING FOR VICTORY OVER THE SIKHS; "SAID" ON SUNDAY, APRIL 11, 1846.—BY THE REV. J. R. BEARD, D.D.

MATT. v. 43, 44, 45—"Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who despitefully use you and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven, for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."

So spake the Light and the Saviour of the world, with an elevation, purity, and largeness of heart, that are as beautiful and touching as they are original. Let us now hear the words of His chief successor, and approved representative in these dominions:

O Lord, God of hosts, in whose hand is power and might irresistible, we, Thine unworthy servants, most humbly acknowledge Thy goodness in the victories lately vouchsafed to the armies of our Sovereign over a host of barbarous invaders, who sought to spread desolation through fruitful and populous provinces enjoying the blessings of peace under the protection of the British Crown. We bless Thee, O merciful Lord, for having brought to a speedy and prosperous issue a war to which no occasion had been given by injustice on our part or apprehension of injury at our hands. To Thee, O Lord, we ascribe the glory; it was Thy wisdom which guided the councils, Thy power which strengthened

the hands of those whom it pleased Thee to use as Thy instruments in the discomforture of the lawless aggressor and the prostration of his ambitious designs. From Thee alone cometh the victory, and the spirit of moderation and mercy in the day of success. Continue, we beseech Thee, to go forth with our armies whensoever they are called into battle in a righteous cause; and dispose the hearts of their leaders to exact nothing more from the vanquished than is necessary for the maintenance of peace and security against violence and rapine.

England, it appears, was in the very position contemplated by the Lord Jesus Christ. She had an enemy: what was her course? An ancient disciple of the same high authority, that bad Christians love their enemies, entered into particulars and explained the nature of the love required. Paul enjoins, "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves; if thine enemy hunger feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." (Rom. x. 19, 21.) Here, then, we have in the clearest and the fullest terms, the instructions of Jesus, the Head of the Church, and of Paul, His Apostle to the Gentiles, touching the conduct we should observe towards our enemies. What has England done? She has acted in direct opposition to the spirit and the letter of these precepts. Instead of loving, she has done her utmost to destroy this enemy. He was an hungered and she gave him no meat; thirsty and she gave him no drink; on the contrary, for bread she gave him a bullet, and a bayonet instead of the wish of peace; and that, too, though the Judge of all the earth has added, "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. xxv. end.) I know not how any teaching can be more plain, simple, emphatic. I know not how duty can be more explicitly set forth. I know not how human obligations can be more strongly enforced. Nor do I know what Christianity is, if this is not at least an essential feature of Christianity. I am equally at a loss to say how these explicit injunctions can by any ingenuity be explained away. There they stand, free from ambiguity, as clear as the love is pure and lofty which they recommend. You may deny the authority of the speakers, and so get rid of the precept. But what shall be said of *his* consistency, who, admitting the authority, contravenes the precept? Has not the

Saviour expressly condemned those who called Him "Lord, Lord," but did not the things which he commanded? Notwithstanding these facts, England has again slaughtered, instead of loving her enemies. Perhaps, however, it is a solitary act? It is part of a long-continued, and carefully supported system. Perhaps it is the outburst of sudden passion. It is the natural and inevitable consequence of a deliberate plan. At any rate, it is the act of soldiers—men more distinguished for bravery than Christian knowledge. The Church of this country is part and parcel of the British Constitution. Why are our Bishops near the throne? Why do they sit in the chair of authority, and the upper hall of the Legislature? And what else than what our priests have made it—our priests located in every district and corner of the land—what else is the general character of this nation, which, while proud of the name of Christian, sanctions and supports the war proceedings of our legislators, and hates, starves, and destroys, instead of loving its enemies. But the concurrence of its spiritual guides in the recent sanguinary deeds on the Indian Sutlej is, alas! put beyond a doubt by the prayer issued at the command of her Majesty by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and recited on the last Lord's-day in every church and chapel in England and Wales. Here the head of the Anglican Church appears in his own proper person, and in words which he either wrote or adopted, expresses his entire approval of the aims and purposes of the conquerors, and, by implication, of the passions which raged in their breasts, and the deeds of blood and death which they performed. It may, indeed, be pleaded that the Archbishop wrote not spontaneously, but on the command of his Sovereign. What then, is it an extenuation that a teacher of the people teaches error only when expressly bidden; that a minister of Christ stirs himself up to pray when political influences bear upon him? Is true piety the offspring of command? Can it be prepared and vended as a merchandise? Is gratitude to God dependent in its flow on the fountain head of civil power? This political piety is most spurious. Where in the New Testament is the precedent for this union of devotion and regal authority—of blood and prayer? The High Priest who put forth this form of supplication may have com-

plied with the claims of his duty as a subject to an earthly potentate, but how stands he in the sight of the King of Kings, whose messenger and son, Jesus Christ, said, "Love your enemies?" He may have fulfilled duties imposed on him by his position, but that position is one of his own choice, long sought after, and earnestly and tenaciously held. For the acts which it imposes on him he is, in consequence, wholly responsible. Here, then, is a minister of Christ making himself a party to a proceeding which is a practical contradiction to one of the most important and explicit commands of his Master. Such is one, and a very lamentable, consequence of the union of Church and State. Political piety, coming from political religion, has never yet failed, and never will fail to be corrupt. But, in truth, the writer of this song of triumph would appear to have found pleasure in the performance of his task. The whole tone of the composition discloses a mind in harmony with the occasion. The organ would not, indeed, have swelled into a full chorus of gratulation and praise, had not the hand of the great mistress touched the keys. But the instrument appears to have been quite ready, waiting only those delicate yet potent fingers; on whose approach its "sleeping music" pealed forth in strains both full and glad. Anglican episcopacy, then, is, in full, answerable for this prayer of thanksgiving, which, as we have seen, asks of God the very opposites of what Christ approved and enjoined. The objection involved in these facts is fundamental. Whatever the form of supplication may contain, it cannot, if it approve of war, be acceptable to the enlightened and faithful disciple of Christ. All thanksgivings for victory are bad. They all imply some approval of slaughtering enemies. In consequence, they are so far not only un-Christian but anti-Christian. The Gospel must be constructed anew, or such practices must be given up.

But, to my mind, these triumphal odes in devotional prose, wear too much the character of impiety. God is thanked for the victory. He in consequence fought the battle. From Him the skill to plan, and the force to execute the murderous undertaking. This is what every prayer of the kind declares, directly or by implication. Now, what right have we to make these assumptions? What right have we to claim the special aid of Heaven?

What do we by this but impute our plans and our enterprises to the universal Father? Is it pious or impious to make every thrust be carried home by His mighty hand? —every volley bearing torture and death, be guided by His finger? View the scene a little nearer. Mark the passions which rage on both sides, and on every hand. Is this what Christ meant, when He said "Love your enemies?" And when these passions have once sunk to rest, the rage died away, the fury exhausted, the ill-will calmed to indifference—then pass over that field of battle, mark the gore, the blood, the severed or shattered limbs, the dying and the dead; hear the low moaning of the worn sufferer, and the shrieks of the tortured one; see the weeping and half distracted mother seeking her only son in this wide slaughter-house of human beings; and tell me, I pray, are you in sight and hearing of these things, prepared to ascribe them to the special act of God? Yet this you do, when you thank him for giving you victory over your foes.

Still further, such a proceeding is an undue and unwarranted assumption of being in the right. It takes for granted the very thing to be proved. It takes this for granted at the bar of God, the Judge of all. It anticipates his sentence, and takes care to make that sentence a favourable one. In its very nature it is a pharasaical proceeding. The Pharisee thanked God that he was not as other men, and then went on to recount his own righteous deeds. After such a model does the prayer now before us, tell of the blessings of peace enjoyed under the protection of the British Crown; declare that the war had not been occasioned "by any injustice on our part, or apprehension of injury at our hands," and boast of the spirit of moderation and mercy in the day of success. Now, suppose that these were admitted facts, are they facts which ought to enter into a prayer? Are our prayers to be made occasions of self-glorification? The Saviour has given us a model in the prayer that bears His sacred name. Is there in that any recital or the slightest mention of human merits? On the contrary, the Saviour gave this command, "When ye shall have all these things which are commanded you, say We are unprofitable servants." (Luke xvii. 10.) Well, however, may those who have done the reverse of

what Jesus commanded in respect of enemies, do the reverse also of what he enjoined in regard to prayer. One misdeed necessitates another.

But the truth of these self-praisings may be questioned. The enemy, it is said, had nothing to fear. Nothing to fear from a power which, being a stranger to the soil, has gone on from intrigue to victory, from victory to intrigue; now assailing, now protecting, now embroiling, now tranquillising, but always gaining territory; becoming more formidable, if not also more ambitious! I say that every independent chief in India has everything to fear from British diplomacy, prowess, and love of gain.

As to the blessings of peace alleged to have been enjoyed under the protection of the British Crown, let them be all that the composer of this prayer could wish to represent them—though to me they appear the bare possibilities of the future, rather than the substantial realities of the past; still one word here employed, betrays the hollowness of the plea. "*Protection,*" which is a soft synonym for servitude; protection, which is never accepted unless by the politically weak, or the personally degraded; protection, when looked closely into, means that the English hold their power in India by the right of conquest, and that as conquerors they govern the country. Now, then, I say, that viewing such a state of things in the light of the war system, the Sikhs were justified in rising against their protectors, that is their conquerors, and vindicating their liberty and independence. Let us do unto others as we would be done by. Let us suppose the case our own. The Sikhs are the protectors, the British the protected. Would not the hand that sundered the unworthy bond be blessed by a thousand lips and lauded in ten thousand churches? How then can we impute to an enemy that, as a crime, which in a fellow citizen we should extol as a merit? and how can we presume to do so in the Court of Heaven? Still worse is the claim to "moderation and mercy in the day of success." I do not intend to intimate that our soldiers did anything beyond the ordinary cruelty of War; but I do mean to say, that they did that which should have caused all claim to the exercise of moderation and mercy to be left out at least in a prayer. The act to which I allude, I consider so horrible, that I will not

attempt to describe it in my own words. It has been thus set forth:

Notwithstanding all these accumulated defences, and the obstinate resistance of the Sikhs, the courage of the British troops overcame every obstacle; and the enemy after suffering severely from the fire of musketry and artillery, were eventually driven by the bayonet and the sabre (for even the British cavalry made their way into the works). in a dense and disorderly mass, upon the bridge, and into the river in their rear. Then commenced one of the most fearful scenes of slaughter that has been witnessed in modern warfare. The bridge of boats, far too small, if it had remained perfect. to admit the mass of fugitives crowding upon it, was partially broken down or sunk by their weight, and the river, having been suddenly swelled by rain, was hardly, if at all, fordable. Thousands of men were therefore struggling in water beyond their depth, exposed to the close and murderous fire poured upon them from the British musketry and artillery. As the Sikhs, on that and previous occasions, had shown no mercy to their opponents,—cruelly butchering the wounded who fell near their ranks,—no mercy was shown to them by the exasperated soldiers; and their loss, by the storm of shot poured upon them, and by the waters of the Sutlej, was so enormous as to produce a total disorganization of their army, and to render the idea of resisting the subsequent operations of the British army altogether hopeless.—*Manchester Guardian, April* 4th, 1846.

Now, granting that this wholesale slaughter was required by policy, was it right, was it becoming, to proclaim our "moderation" before the throne of Almighty God? The carnage may have been necessary, but no one will say that it partook of moderation or mercy. I here appeal to those who do not object to war, and I ask them if they can justify the terms by which the conduct of our troops in the moment of certain victory, is characterized in the Archbishop's prayer?

That prayer is no less un-English than it is un-Christian. It is the attribute of an Englishman to succour and raise a fallen enemy. This form of thanksgiving is in truth a bill of indictment. The Archbishop here appears like Satan of old against Job, as the Attorney-General, retained and pleading in the Court of Heaven for the condemnation of the Sikhs. Not content with beating and slaughtering them on earth, we here labour to procure a verdict against them at the bar of God. The priest follows up the rout caused by our Generals; and, encountering the foe after his last death struggle, meets him in the other world with a bill of pains and penalties. What are its allegations? The Sikhs are barbarous invaders—lawless agressors having ambitious designs. Well! these are bad qualities. Let us look at each separately. The Sikhs are barbarous. As such, they are rather to be pitied

than punished. It is bad enough to be barbarous without being hung, beaten, and destroyed. And if barbarism is a bad thing, those who call themselves Christians should aim to cure it. Is war an appropriate remedy? Are the Sikhs less barbarous now that they have been vanquished? It is possible to brutalise barbarians, and for this miserable end I know not a more efficacious means than war.

But has this allegation more truth than others which we have examined? I have no hesitation in pronouncing it an exaggeration. I will translate a few words explanatory of their condition prior to the spread of the British power in India: "The Sikhs belong to the family of Hindoos. In religion they have separated themselves from the population of the countries about the Ganges. They profess a peculiar faith, which a Hindoo priest, by name Nanik, founded in the commencement of the 15th century. Nanik preached a pure theism and universal toleration. He maintained that the image worship of Hindostan had led men away from the service of the true God. The worship of God he held to be man's chief duty, the form to be altogether a matter of indifference. This belief in God and in future retribution was the root of his system. Very simple prayers constituted public worship: his chief commands were never to strive about dogmas, to bathe often, and to abstain from the flesh of swine." * Such in its essence is the religion of the Sikhs. It is true they have more or less departed from its injunctions and neglected its spirit; but if such unfaithfulness suffices to sustain the imputation of being barbarians, there are professed Christians—ay, even on the bench of bishops—who would do well to change either their conduct or their name. At any rate, the religious principles of the Sikh reformer may read a useful lesson to such as have neither simple prayers nor a tolerant Creed.

But the enemy is an ambitious invader. If so, let him be condemned on earth, and prayed *for*, not *against*, before the Throne of Grace. And let not condemnation proceed from the lips of a British legislator; for what but ambition gained our Indian empire, and what but invaders are we on an Indian soil?

---

* Ergänzungsblätter. No. 36, p. 563.

"Aggressors!" *we* are the aggressors. The first as well as the last blow came from a British hand. The fact bears stating in a very different way. The Archbishop has made his speech against the accused. Could the dead speak in self defence, would they not plead that it was the sword of liberty which they drew—the sword of national emancipation and independence? Would they not declare that it was in fighting for their country against ambitious, if not lawless, aggressors that they had lost their lives? The verdict in this issue of the Great Judge of Heaven and Earth, I will not presume to anticipate. But in view of what has now been said, I must declare that this triumphal and accusatory prayer offends against common justice and common sense as much as it does against good feeling, and the spirit and precepts of the Gospel. But while I leave the arraignment of the Sikhs before that high court into which political piety has ventured to carry it, one great truth I must declare—a truth which, whether high or low, Britain or Hindoo, we should never forget, namely that God's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts; that it is with an equal eye, as Lord of all, he looks down on Brahmin and Bishop, Sikh and Queen, Barbarian, Scythian, Bond and Free: that he loves each and all alike; that the Thames in his eyes is no more precious than the Ganges; that an invader of a century old is as much an invader as one of yesterday; and that he knows no difference, is no respecter of persons, unless so far as one man or one nation is more than another enlightened, tolerant, merciful, forgiving, just, beneficent, of a lowly mind, and of a meek and quiet spirit.

SELECTIONS.

Sorrow for sin is not repentance. Repentance is a great volume of duty; and godly sorrow is but the frontispiece or title page; it is the harbinger or first introduction to it.—*Taylor.*

There is no occasion to affect a singularity of behaviour, nor seek for uncommon ways of employing our time, in order to live a life of holiness: there needs only to consider the station wherein we are placed as the call of God; and to acquaint ourselves in all the parts of it, momentous or trivial, in such a manner as that we could not have done better upon the occasion, all circumstances regarded.—*Tucker.*

ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENTS.

No. II.

In a former paper on this subject, (pp. 16—19), we adduced some reasons which should lead the Unitarian to unite with those who desire the abrogation of Capital Punishments, and briefly showed that they were opposed to the spirit of Christianity. We promised to prove that they were also contrary to enlightened policy.

We speak of *mother* countries, and *paternal* governments: and, if this idea were acted on, our laws would be such as a wise parent would frame for the good order of his own family; and as a father does not cut off a child from his love, for a single offence, so law would still recognise a son of the state in every transgressor, and be far more anxious to reclaim, than to exterminate, those who were disobedient.

We shall not attempt a treatise on a subject which occupies volumes, and which is not yet exhausted. It will be our present object to point out a few of the characteristics of what we may term a *good* punishment, none of which are possessed by hanging, or any other violent death.

1.—Punishments should be *reformatory*. It is true that their obvious end is the prevention of crime; and, therefore, it might be alleged that it would be justifiable for the good of society, even to aggravate the wickedness of the criminal, if the innocent are thus saved from falling. Christianity, however, tells us not to do evil that good may come. The offender is our brother, though an erring one. If we interfere with his liberty—and this we seem justified in doing, since he has impaired the peace of the state—we shall either make him better or worse, for he cannot remain as he was. It will be found the dictate of policy as well as of humanity, to make him better. If we succeed in this, we shall send him forth eager to reclaim those whom he has misled, to neutralise the effects of his former ill conduct, and to benefit society, which has dealt with him in such wise mercy. We know that criminals generally go from our prisons worse than they entered them; and the feeling now prevails, that as God chastens His sons to make them better, so ought the state. It is obvious that the punishment of death is *not*

reformatory, in the ordinary sense of the word; and yet, if we are to believe what chaplains say upon the scaffold, there are few who perish there but what are pretty sure of salvation, whilst the great majority of those who die in the natural way are equally sure to be damned. God alone knows what effect may be worked upon the mind by the prospect of an immediate entrance on the unseen path, in the midst of all the vigour of health; and it would be presumptuous to deny that a change may be effected in the heart of the criminal, which is to be the era of a happier existence; yet we may be allowed to be sceptical, as we have too many lamentable instances of the uncertain nature of repentance induced by the prospect of death. The criminal, however piously he may speak, has often his thoughts distracted by the possibility of escape, and is more anxious to meet his fate in such a way as to elicit the approbation of the surrounding multitudes, than with the sober-minded humility which befits the Christian. God has never told us that the punishment of death is reformatory; we must, therefore, judge from what we see; and, in the absence of proof that the criminal is made better by being hung, we may take for granted that, generally speaking, he is not. Did our limits permit, it would be easy to narrate the most shocking scaffold-scenes. Men whose guilt is morally certain, have entered eternity with the most awful perjury upon their lips, or with brutal indifference and levity. The argument from the non-reformatory nature of Capital Punishments would have more weight, if other punishments were more satisfactory in their issue. "It must be owned," said the celebrated Blackstone, "that it is much easier to extirpate, than to amend mankind; yet that man must be esteemed both a weak and a cruel surgeon, who cuts off every limb, which, through indolence or ignorance, he will not attempt to cure." On the hospital of St Michele at Rome is this inscription, which the philanthropist Howard adopted as the motto for his work, "*Parum est coercere improbos pœnâ, nisi probos efficias disciplinâ.*"*

2.—Punishment, to be just, should be *graduatable*, (or capable of graduation). There are various degrees of

* It is little to coerce the dishonest by punishment, unless you make them honest by correction.

enormity in crimes. We do not regard a man so guilty, who kills one individual, as he who poisons a whole family. And among those who have taken but one life, there will be a material difference in the circumstances of the respective cases, and the motives which led to them. Murderers are no longer hung in chains, or drawn and quartered, nor would the feeling of the age sanction the use of torture. An assassin then might argue, that, as he would be executed for his first murder, and could only die once, he might add to his sins with impunity. This was the case, especially, when robbery was punished with death; as it was then a matter of cold calculation with the highwayman, that it was for his interest to murder his victim, because he thus diminished his chance of detection, whilst, if convicted, he could suffer no more.

3.—Punishment should be *remissible.* It may be for the interest of society to pardon the offender, after he has undergone part of his sentence: or perhaps it may prove that he is innocent. The evidence in cases of murder is generally of a circumstantial character. Few, except under the influence of passion, would slay another openly. The eye of God alone looks on the bloody deed. We may feel morally certain that the person whom we accuse is guilty; and yet, he may suggest another way of accounting for all the facts, which seem to bear so strongly against him. Even if he is unable to do this, he may be innocent. Chambers, in one of his useful tracts, has given several instances, in which innocent persons have suffered; and in another world, we shall doubtless learn thousands more; and many will rise again to reproach society for unjustly abbreviating their season of probation.

We will not dwell further on this argument; but to many it will present itself so vividly to the imagination, that it is one of the most forcible that we can use. We have observed in public lectures, that the audience has been more affected by the wrongful death of one man in a hundred, than by all the crime and evil passions which the execution of the remaining ninety-nine has caused.

4.—Punishment should be *certain.* We are not inclined to do things, for which we feel sure that we shall suffer. If we were practically convinced that anything

would bring us more pain than pleasure, we should naturally shrink from it. We sin from a want of vital faith in the truth—that sin and misery are linked together. The greatest suffering, which there is a chance of our escaping, often affects us less than a smaller amount which we are certain to endure. There is a possibility that we may be killed on a railway, but this contingency does not influence us so much as the positive loss of time and comfort which we should endure in a more tardy conveyance. Few minds can accurately compute chances, and hope or desire generally pervert the judgment. If a criminal was sure to be punished, be the punishment ever so small, he would be more inclined to keep the law, than if his conviction were doubtful, and his sentence uncertain.

Within the present century, two hundred offences were declared by Act of Parliament to be worthy of instant death.* Now, in most cases, the extreme penalty was not inflicted,† and when the punishment was transmuted to a lighter one, it did not seem nearly so terrible, as if the lighter one had been that originally threatened, and executed fully.

The most barefaced perjury was resorted to, to shield the prisoner, and the jury would, in defiance of their oaths, bring in a man guilty of stealing to the value of thirty-nine shillings, when it was notorious that he had stolen as many pounds.

When the laws are more severe than public feeling sanctions, the obvious tendency is not to enforce them. When forgery was capital, the defrauded person feared to prosecute; if he prosecuted, the witnesses were loath to give their testimony; if they gave it, the judge took a merciful view of the case; if he was strict, the jury trembled at the responsibility of sending a fellow creature into eternity; if they gave a verdict, efforts were made to procure an alteration of the sentence; so that the tempted man saw before him so many chances of escape,

---

* It was not till the year 1812 that an act was passed to repeal the statute of Elizabeth, which made it a capital offence for soldiers or mariners to beg or wander without a pass.

† Of 1872 persons who had been committed to Newgate for stealing in dwelling houses, in the seven years preceding 1810, only *one* was was executed.

that he felt a comparative impunity in the commission of his crime.

What we have said of other offences, may be applied to the case of murder. There is a growing feeling against executions; and those, whose fathers would have exulted in being parties to hang a murderer, are more ready to perjure themselves than to cause his death.

We will not dwell now on the fearful anomaly, that, by the unwise nature of our laws, one crime leads on to perhaps twenty perjuries, which are sins of a fearful character, yet are in these cases prompted by the most humane feelings, but draw the conclusion, that as long as any punishment is greater than men are willing to inflict, in many cases the offender will escape with impunity.

We leave to another paper the consideration how far hanging is *exemplary*; we have contented ourselves now with showing that is not reformatory, graduatable, remissible, nor certain; and we would beg our readers to consider whether the penalties inflicted by our criminal code in general, have these important qualities in a due degree. The opposer of Capital Punishments would be able to take stronger ground, if he could point to other existing modes of correction as unobjectionable. But we are not to close our eyes to the existence of one evil, because we see others which will remain to be removed. On the contrary, this should incite us to greater energy; and whilst we would not cut off *men* before their time, we would exterminate *usages*, which breed corruption, and poison the system with which they are connected.

R. L. C.

A FEW WORDS ON JUDGMENT.

BY JAMES HENRY, D.D., DUBLIN.

(*Continued from a preceding Number.*)

And the people of those islands read in the holy book of their religion, these commands of their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

"Judge not that ye be not judged, for with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

And they read also, "If thy brother trespass against thee rebuke him, and if he repent forgive him; and if he

trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him."

And again they read, "Peter came to the Lord and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him, till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee until seven times, but until seventy times seven."

And again they read, "Unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek, offer also the other, and him that taketh away thy cloak, forbid not to take thy coat also."

And they read yet again, "When ye stand praying, forgive if ye have aught against any, that your Father also which is in Heaven may forgive your trespasses. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in Heaven forgive your trespasses."

And when the people of those islands read all these commandments in the holy book of their religion, and perceived that the Lord had strictly forbidden his disciples to judge one another, and had taken vengeance into his own hands, saying, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord;" they were sorely perplexed, and murmured, saying, "It is a hard thing to let the guilty escape."

Then one of them whose name was Justus, and who was celebrated among all the people of those islands for his wisdom and knowledge, said, "Notwithstanding we are Christians, there are so many guilty among us that we must have judgment and punishment as if we were heathens, else our society cannot exist even for a single day."

And another of them whose name was Liber, and who was as celebrated among the people of those islands, for his Christian faith and charity, as Justus was for his wisdom and knowledge, said, "We know that the Lord will certainly judge and punish the guilty at the last day; but lest that punishment should be less than their iniquities deserve, let us punish them also. So shall the hearts of the evil doers be struck with terror, for every man shall be punished twice, once by us, and again by the Lord."

And another of them, whose name was Clemens, said, "How know we that the Lord will certainly punish the

guilty at the last day, for His name is Mercy, and he hath declared that He will pardon to the uttermost, even at the eleventh hour? Let us therefore make haste and punish the guilty while we have them here with us, lest, peradventure, they escape punishment altogether."

But some of them objected, and said, "Whether will ye listen to what these men say, or to the Lord, who saith, 'Ye shall not judge your brother that offendeth, but shall forgive him even to seventy times seven times; and if ye do not, neither will I forgive you.'"

Then Justus said, "Simple-minded, like sheep! Know ye not that it is easy to do both the one and the other; both to follow the word of God and the wisdom of men; both to forgive, and at the same time to punish as if ye had not forgiven. Therefore let every man who has a quarrel or an offence against his neighbour, first forgive him, and then deliver him to the officer; and let the officer forgive him, and deliver him to the judge; and let the judge forgive him, and deliver him to the executioner; and let the executioner forgive him, and execute the sentence upon him: so shall ye enjoy both the sweetness of punishing, and the reward which the Lord hath promised to forgiving."

Then all the people applauded and said, "We will do even so; we will forgive as becometh the disciples of Christ, and we will judge and punish as if we had not forgiven." And straightway they made arrangements on the most extensive scale, that every man might certainly be brought to judgment for every offence which he committed: and they appointed different kinds of judges for the different kinds of offences, greater judges for the greater offences, and lesser judges for the less, and there was no offence so small that there was no judge to judge it. And judgment they called justice; and the officers whom they appointed to seize offenders, and to bring them before the judges, they called peace-officers. And the peace-officers were all armed with deadly weapons, with which they assaulted and sometimes killed those who refused to go quietly with them to be judged. And if any persons joined those who were accused of offences, and helped them to resist the peace officers, the judges ordered out the soldiers, which the people of those islands kept for the purpose of killing their enemies, and com-

manded them to fall upon those persons, and to shoot, and stab, and utterly destroy them, in the same way as they shot, and stabbed, and destroyed the enemies of the country. And both the judges who gave these orders, and the soldiers who obeyed them, were the brethren in Christ of those whom they killed for taking part with the accused against the peace-officers, and used to go down on their knees every morning and every evening before the most High God, and solemnly promised to live in love, and peace, and charity with all men, judging no man, but forgiving every man his neighbour, even as they prayed that God, for Christ's sake, might forgive them.

And the number of those who were brought to judgment in those islands increased daily, for not only were those brought to judgment who had not repented, but those also who had repented; not only those who had offended knowing the law, but those also who had offended from ignorance of it, whether that ignorance arose from neglect, or from the difficulty or impossibility of knowing the law; they were all judged and punished.

And the people of those islands took more pleasure in reading the accounts of the offences which their brethren in Christ had committed, than in any other kind of reading; and they employed persons to attend in all the halls of judgment, for the purpose of taking the most precise and particular accounts of all the proceedings in those halls, and the names and addresses of all the persons who were judged, and a description of their persons and of their occupations, and the names of their family connections and kindred; and these accounts were published every day, and were eagerly read by the people of those islands every morning, as soon as they had risen up from their morning prayers, and every evening before their evening prayers to that merciful God who had commanded them, saying, "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." And by these means the shame and the disgrace of every man who had committed an offence became immediately known to all his brethren, and he was pointed at with the finger of scorn, so that his feelings were irritated, and he hated those who scorned him. So scorn on the one side, and

hatred on the other, arose between those who were inhabitants of the same country and of the same city, and who were friends and relatives and brethren in Christ.

And many of those who were judged and punished, were so injured in their worldly circumstances, both by the nature of the punishment itself, and by the shame and the disgrace attendant on it, that they became unable to support themselves by any lawful trade or occupation, and were necessitated either to become paupers or to resort to unlawful occupations, by which they became subject to new judgments and punishments, until at last they became reckless and desperate, and both they and their innocent families were totally and irretrievably ruined.

And the people of those islands took every day more and more delight in judging and punishing one another. And they said, "Let us make a law that no man shall overlook or pass by an injury, even although he is himself the only person injured." And they did so, and compelled every man to give information of every injury which he received, and bound him in heavy penalties to prosecute the offender to the uttermost.

And the people of those islands said, "This is a good law, and in accordance with the mild and merciful spirit of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; let us, therefore, make another law to compel every man, even although he is not injured himself, to give information if he sees his neighbour breaking any of the laws or regulations which we have made." And they did so, and then if any man saw his brother in Christ offending, and did not give information, he was judged and punished as if the offence had been his own.

And the people of those islands said, "Let us make yet another law, that if any man sees a contention between a peace-officer and one who refuses to go with him to be judged, he shall help the peace-officer, even although he may see and know that he is in the wrong, and shall violently assault the man, and shall compel him to go with the peace-officer to be judged; and that whosoever neglects to do so, shall be judged and punished as if he had himself been guilty of the offence." And they did so, and inserted in the preamble of the law the command which the Lord Christ Jesus gave his disciples, to avoid

all judgment, and punishment, and strife, and contention, and live peaceably with all men.

And each individual in those islands was desirous to increase his own ease and comfort at the expense of all the rest, and was continually endeavouring to have laws and regulations made to prevent his neighbours from doing those things which he disliked, and to compel them to do those things which he liked. And when individuals were not able by themselves to cause those laws to be passed which they desired, they associated together for the purpose, and went about collecting subscriptions, and holding meetings, and making speeches, until they got considerable numbers of the weaker and more ignorant sort to join them in their outcry for those laws and measures which they wished to be passed for their own private benefit. And so many persons sought to have laws and regulations made for the purpose either of restraining or compelling the actions of others, that at length all the persons in those islands came to be compelled or restrained in almost every act by some law. And when this result had taken place, the people of those islands rejoiced and said, "This is the most free and Christian country on the face of the earth, for there is none other where there are so many laws and regulations, and judgments and penalties, and where each man has so little power over his own most innocent acts, and pursuits, and recreations, and so much power over those of his neighbours." But some of them murmured and said, "We still fall short of that perfect brotherly love and freedom which is in Christ Jesus, for there are still some of our brethren who escape judgment for their offences; let us therefore offer rewards for informations against offenders, and let us bribe every man to inform against his friend, and his neighbour, and his brother in Christ, and even against his father, and his mother, and his children." And they did so, and immediately there was a great increase in the number of those who were brought to judgment, and the informers increased and multiplied, and became greedy after rewards, and for the sake of them, informed even against innocent persons; and the innocent persons whom they informed against were judged, and some of them were punished, and others of them were acquitted.

Then the informers debated among themselves, saying, "Why do the judges acquit some of those innocent persons whom we have accused?" And one of them said, "It is because not only the persons are innocent, but the offences of which we accuse them purely imaginary and fictitious. Let us henceforth accuse them of real offences, and our difficulty will be less." And another said, "What, if we commit the offences ourselves, and then accuse them of them?" Then all the informers cried out, "Thou hast well said, and we will do even so, for not only will the conviction be more sure, but the blood-money also being the reward of a double crime, will be sweeter." And they did so, and from that time forward the craft of the informer throve and flourished exceedingly among the Christians of those islands.

And the people of those islands said, "Our system of giving bribes for informations against offenders worketh well, and no disciple of Christ can doubt but the Lord approveth of it; let us therefore extend it to our peace-officers." And they did so, and rewarded their peace-officers in proportion to the number of persons whom they informed against, and whom they brought before the judges for judgment, and whom they convicted.

But after some time it was observed, that notwithstanding all the measures which had been adopted to secure the conviction of offenders, considerable numbers of them still escaped conviction; so the people of those islands complained again, and said, "What availeth it that our brethren in Christ are informed against and brought to judgment, if they are not also convicted and punished?" And they asked Justus, saying, "Canst thou tell us why there are not more convictions in proportion to the number of informations and accusations?" And Justus replied, "It is because the witnesses are disinterested persons, and their testimony does not always support the charge against the accused, but, on the contrary, oft-times proves it to be false." Then all the peop e cried out, "Would to God that we had witnesses who would always be of one accord with the informers and accusers, so should no guilty brother in Christ escape the punishment due to his iniquity." Then Justus said, "There is one way by which ye may ensure a perfect agreement between the accuser and the witness, so that

whatever the accuser says, the witness will certainly swear to." Then all the people cried out again, "Show us that way, and we shall be happy, and thou shalt obtain a great name for thyself among all Christian nations." Then Justus answered, "What more have ye to do but to make the same person both accuser and witness?" But the people objected and said, "If no one accuses but those who may happen to be present at the time, and see the offence actually committed, convictions will indeed be more certain, but informations and accusations will be proportionably fewer." "That will certainly be the case," replied Justus, "if ye depend, as hitherto, on chance witnesses. Such witnesses indeed may answer tolerably well among heathen and semi-barbarous nations, but are totally unsuited to the wants of a highly civilized and Christian society. Ye must therefore no longer depend upon them, but employ hired persons, whose duty it shall be, first, to witness the offence; secondly, to inform against the offender and accuse him before the judge; and thirdly, to prove the truth of their own charge by their own oath on the holy book of our religion." Then all the people cried out, "Behold the Christian Aristides! behold the Christian Aristides!" And while they vied with each other who should praise Justus most, Liber said, "Justus hath indeed spoken well, and what persons are so fit and proper to perform the double office of informer and witness as our peace-officers, for they are already practised in the first of those offices, and it is easy for them to learn the second? Let us therefore greatly increase their number, and let us station them in all our streets, and at the doors of all our houses, and let them watch what every man does, and where every man goes, and let them listen to what every man says; and then, if any man commit an offence, there will be ready on the spot not only an accuser and a witness, but also an officer to take him into custody; so shall no man escape." "And still further," said Clemens, "the peace-officers being the servants of the judge, and bound to obey his orders in all things, ye shall by this arrangement give the judge that salutary control over both the accuser and the witness, which is indispensable to the due administration of justice, and especially to the conviction and punishment of accused persons."

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

MRS. DANA'S LETTERS.

["Letters Addressed to Relatives and Friends, chiefly in Reply to Arguments in Support of the Doctrine of the Trinity. By Mary S. B. Dana. Boston, 1845."]

LETTER II.

THE TERMS GOD AND LORD.

My Dear Father:

The words God and Lord do not, I suppose, necessarily denote *absolute supremacy*, although they do denote dominion and power. In studying the Scriptures, we ought to bear in mind the common sense in which certain terms were used by the common people at the time the Scriptures were written; because we know that, in the course of time, words do very much change their signification. In the Bible we have the term God applied in various ways. In regard to its use among the Greek and Roman philosophers and poets, who lived about the time of our Saviour, we are informed by the history of that period; we know that the term was used with very extensive latitude; and it is natural to suppose that the writers of the New Testament, who were chosen from the people, used their terms as they were used by the people, and intended to give a meaning which would be readily *understood* by the people. The early Christians used the word God in relation to different degrees of superiority or power, and not *as it is now used*, in an absolute sense. And I wish these facts to be borne in mind while you peruse this letter. I am free to confess, that, as a general thing, the term should not now be applied to any but the Supreme Being, because now it has an absolute and definite meaning; though, in considering those passages of Scripture where it is applied to subordinate beings, it must still be used, but always with the fact of its different use in another age of the world kept steadily in view.

In this sense I do admit that the Saviour of the world, the Messiah, may be called a God; and I know that he is constantly called Lord; and why should he not be, when his Father *made* him *both* Lord and Christ? But it is concerning the term *God* that I wish to write. It is then, I think, a relative term, a name for a being who has dominion. Now, we are expressly told that the Supreme Being gave Christ *all power in Heaven* and *on earth*. Likewise, because the Father loved the Son, he gave "*all things* into his hand." He *crowned* Him with *glory* and *honour*, and did set him over the work of his hands. And, "in that he put all in subjection under him, *he left nothing* that is not put under him." Thus, it appears to me, in the sense which I have before explained, a sense which was well understood when the Scriptures were written, our Heavenly Father *made* his well beloved Son a God over us, and over all the works of his hands; as he made Moses a God to Pharaoh—and as he called them Gods *to whom the word of God came*—and as he commanded his people not to revile the Gods. Thus, truly, there are Gods many and Lords

many; yet to us there is, *in an absolute sense*, but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, &c. Christ is then made a God to us, *under Him*, who is "the blessed and *only* Potentate—the *only* wise God—who *only* hath immortality."

This view of the subject explains to my mind all those passages where Christ is called God and Lord, *even as they stand in our common version*, though most of them are said to admit of a different translation. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever"* —that is, that throne which God had *given* to his Son, which must mean the seat of power in the mediatorial kingdom. It does not follow that he who occupies the throne *by permission of the Father*, who obtained it by the gift of the Father, existed from all eternity. The assertion is concerning the throne, or dominion, which is to endure for ever; though, when cometh the end, it is to be delivered up to God the Father. In this way I can also understand how Peter called his master Lord of all—preaching peace by Jesus Christ, (he is Lord of all.)"† For when he lifted up his voice on the day of Pentecost, he closed his noble address to the men of Judea, and all that dwelt at Jerusalem, with these words: "know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both *Lord* and Christ."

Nor am I startled at that passage where Christ, according to Trinitarians, is said to be "over all, God blessed for ever."‡ For we are expressly told *how this can be*. If all things were put under him, he certainly is "over all," and consequently a God; though let us never forget how "manifest" it is that "*He is excepted* which did put all things under him."

I will now tell you, my dear father, how my mind has been satisfied in regard to those texts which you have proposed for my consideration. The first is Is. vi. 1—10, compared with John xii 41. They do not appear to me at all to favour the doctrine of the supreme deity of the Son of God. The purposes of God are constantly spoken of as having been accomplished long before they literally were. It is a common mode of speech in the Bible, and implies the certainty of the fulfilment of God's designs. Thus we read of the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world. As the *Messiah*, Isaiah foresaw Christ's glory. To give you my own ideas of what may be the meaning of these passages, I cannot do better than to quote the remarks they have drawn forth from *Trinitarian* commentators. I will now quote from the 361st page of Wilson's *Concessions of Trinitarians*.

"These things said Isaiah, when, by the spirit of prophecy, he saw his glory, i. e. *foresaw the glorious appearance of Christ on earth in respect of the excellency of his doctrine and greatness of his miracles*, and spake of him, i. e. *prophesied of Christ*.—WELLS. [Similarly, ERASMUS, *Op.* vii. p. 600; GROTIUS, BAXTER, and HAMMOND.]

"*His glory;* that is, according to the application of the evangelist, *the glory of Christ;* though Isaiah spoke of the Father.—SIMON. [According to the Racovian Catechism, p. 116, CHRY-

* Hebrews i. 8. † Acts x 36. ‡ Rom. ix. 5,

SOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, GUIDO PERPINIAN, MONOTESSARO, and ALCAZAR, maintained that it was the glory of God the Father which appeared to Isaiah.]

"ΑΥΤΟΥ, *his*, refers to God . . . . . MORUS justly observes, that Isaiah, in chap vi., did not speak of the Messianic kingdom.—J. G. ROSENMULLER.

"ΕΙΔΕ, *he saw*, either signifies *he foresaw*, as in chap. viii. 56, so that ΑΥΤΟΥ (*his* and *him*) refers, in both clauses, to the Messiah; or rather, it has respect to the description of *the glory of God*, in Isa. vi. 1, *sqq*. The words OF HIM, may, however, probably relate to the Messiah, inasmuch as the antecedent here is not more remote than in other passages.—VATER.

"The pronoun ΑΥΤΟΥ, *his*, should be referred to *Lord* (namely *God*) in ver. 38; . . . . and the passage has respect to Isa. vi. 1. *sqq*. where the prophet describes a vision, and affirms that he saw Jehovah sitting on a throne, &c.—KUINOEL. (So BLOOMFIELD)."

I will merely remark, my dear father, that these and similar explanations of this passage never fell in my way till long after my own mind was settled on the subject, and I had come to the conclusion that it contained no proof whatever of the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ.

The next passage, Rom. ix. 5, I have already noticed.

The next, Phil. ii. 6. 7, even as it is translated in our common version, so far from presenting any difficulty to my mind, is, in my view, a strong Unitarian text. "*Who, being in the form of God*" —that is, the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express *image* of his person—made so by Him who also created man in his own image—"*thought it not robbery to be equal with God.*" He came as the Messenger of God to man, as God's vicegerent on earth, and *in that sense* it *was* no robbery to proclaim himself equal with God, and to demand equal obedience from mankind. He who refuses to obey Christ, refuses obedience to the Father, for the Father spake to the world through him. If we read on, we shall see how it was that he demanded that men should honour him even as they honoured the Father. "God," says the Apostle, "hath highly exalted him, and given him a name that is above every name, that at the name of JESUS every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that he is Lord, *to the glory of God* THE FATHER." The whole passage, it seems to me, *even when read as it is in our English Bibles*, is a clear and satisfactory explanation of the grounds on which our Master thought it not robbery to be equal with God; and seems intended to fill our minds with the most exalted ideas of the dignity and authority of the "one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." But you are undoubtedly aware that many Trinitarians have contended for a different translation of the passage. And many likewise contend that the expression, "*being in the form of God*," does not convey the idea of Christ's own proper deity.

The next passage you mention is found in Rev. i. 6. I will quote the text, with a portion of the fifth verse. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath

made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." Here everlasting glory and dominion are ascribed to Christ. And why not? No Unitarian will object to this. On the contrary, they rejoice to ascribe to him, as the Head of his Church, as the King of saints—aye, even as the King of Kings and Lord of Lords—glory and dominion for ever and ever. The kingdom which God sent his Son to establish, is to endure for ever, and his dominion throughout all generations and glory will for ever crown the head of him who died for man's redemption. But I can see nothing in the text under consideration like a recognition of his supreme divinity. On the contrary, the first verse of the Revelations seems to settle the question in another way. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ," says the author, "*which God gave unto him.*"

I do not see why, in the future world, subordinate worship may not be rendered to Jesus Christ. I am not sure that, even after the Mediatorial kingdom shall have been delivered up to God, and Christ's kingly office, as it related to this world, shall have ceased, the well beloved Son may not be still honoured as a King in Heaven, in reward for his obedience unto death. Why even *we* are made, by Jesus Christ, "kings and priests unto God and his Father," and are, *in a sense*, to reign with him for ever. If we overcome, we shall sit with him on his throne, as he also overcame, and is set down with his Father on his throne.

You next refer me to Rev. v. 5—14. This passage is of very much the same character with the last, and is urged as a proof that Christ is to be worshipped in Heaven. But here homage and worship is rendered to him as to a Lamb slain—as to a redeemer, and not as to the Almighty and supreme God. The worship here described is very different from that rendered to the Father. Let me direct your attention to some remarks of Trinitarian writers upon this passage.

"Here," says Bishop Sherlock, (referring to Chap. iv. 11.) "you see plainly that the adoration paid to God the Father is founded on his being Creator of all things. . . . Here, (referring to Chap. v. 9—12,) you as plainly see the worship paid to Christ to be founded in this, that he was slain, and did by his blood redeem us. . . . From all which it is evident that the worship paid to Christ is founded on the redemption, and relates to that power and authority which *he received from God* at his resurrection."—*Works*, vol. ii. p. 491; Disc. I.

Daubuz remarks: "As the fundamental reason for which God the Father receiveth worship of the Jews and Gentiles, is because he hath created all things, and preserves them by his will, to have it perfected and executed on them; so the fundamental reason for which the Son is worshipped is *because he was slain*, and shed his blood thereby to redeem all mankind." Surely, then, if he is worshipped, *because he was slain*, he is not worshipped as the supreme God.

The next passage, Rev. xxii. 16, I have seen very satisfactorily explained in Pitkin's reply to Baker.

The next reference is to Heb. i. 8. According to my views already expressed in regard to the different senses in which the term *worship* may be used, and in regard to the subordinate worship which I believe may be rendered to Christ—the passage, I think, admits of satisfactory explanation. I see no reason to suppose that the worship there spoken of implies supreme worship, any more than the worship or prostration of the wise men from the east, before the babe of Bethlehem.

Nor do the next passages to which you direct my attention, interfere, as I think, with my views. In 1 Tim. vi. 15, the phrase "King of Kings and Lord of Lords," is applied to the blessed and *only* Potentate, the supreme God; and in Rev. xvii. 14, the same phrase is applied to the Lamb. But it by no means necessarily follows, that these two beings are one and the same, or even equal. If we wait "until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ," He, "who is the blessed and *only* Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords," will "show" us how and why his well beloved Son is also proclaimed "King of Kings and Lord of Lords;" indeed, I think, he has plainly shown it to us already. But now we see through a glass darkly; then, blessed be our Heavenly Father, we shall know even as we are known.

Another of the passages to which you refer, is the Apostolic Benediction, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." 2 Cor. xiii. 14. And in regard to it you say, "It hath ever been among the most conclusive to my mind in favour of the doctrine, which, from its difficulties, you have been tempted to reject." But, my dear father, it does not strike my mind at all in the same way. If *grace* and truth *came by Jesus Christ*, and God gives the influences of his spirit to enlighten and sanctify us, it seems perfectly natural that the "grace" and "communion" which is thus bestowed upon us by the Father, should be mentioned in connection with that "love" which devised and carries on the scheme of redemption. I cannot see how the mere fact of their being named together proves anything in regard to a trinity of persons in the Godhead.

You allude to John i. 1. "The Word was God." If by the term "Word," Christ was *certainly* intended, it would be a strong passage in favour of your views. But that is a question which must, after diligent investigation, be decided by each one for himself. The passage, says Norton, "has been misunderstood through ignorance or disregard to the opinions or modes of conception, which the writer, St. John, had in mind." Some quotations on this subject from his "Statement of Reasons," will show you what has been, to me, a very satisfactory explanation of this difficult passage. "There is no English word," says he, "answering to the Greek word Logos, as here used. It was employed to denote a mode of conception concerning the Deity, familiar at the time when St. John wrote, and intimately blended with the philosophy of his age, but long since obsolete, and so foreign from our habits of thinking, that it is not easy for us to conform

our minds to its apprehension. The Greek word *Logos*, in one of its primary senses, answered nearly to our word *Reason*. It denoted that faculty by which the mind disposes its ideas in their proper relations to each other; the Disposing Power if I may so speak, of the mind. In reference to this primary sense, it was applied to the Deity, but in a wider significance. The Logos of God was regarded not in its strictest sense, as merely the Reason of God; but under certain aspects, as the Wisdom, the Mind, the Intellect of God. To this the creation of all things was *especially* ascribed. The conception may seem obvious in itself; but the cause why the creation was primarily referred to the Logos or Intellect of God, rather than to his goodness or omnipotence, is to be found in the Platonic philosophy, as it existed about the time of Christ, and particularly as taught by the eminent Jewish philosopher, Philo of Alexandria."

Mr. Norton then goes on to describe this philosophy, and especially the strong personification of the Logos. I wish I had time and space to transcribe the whole passage, but must content myself by referring you to the work itself from which these extracts are taken. It will repay an attentive perusal. Mr. Norton continues, "St. John, writing in Asia Minor, where many for whom he intended his Gospel were familiar with the conception of the Logos, has probably for this reason, adopted the term 'Logos' in the proem of his gospel to express *that manifestation of God by Christ*, which is elsewhere referred to the Spirit of God." Mr. Norton's reasons for this opinion are, to my mind, perfectly conclusive; you will find them in his "Statement of Reasons," pp. 229—250.

You allude again, in a more particular manner, to the passage Isa. vi 1—10, as compared with John, xii. 41. You speak of the name Jehovah, as *applied* to Christ, and you inquire, "Who, on such a comparison of the passages, was it, or could it be, whose glory, as Jehovah the prophet saw? By what possible process can these texts be silenced?" They could not be silenced if St. John had expressly informed us that the *whole* display of glory which Isaiah saw, was the glory of *Christ*; but if the words, "when he saw his glory, and spake of him," refer to Christ, which some Trinitarians doubt,* it must be to Christ's glory *as Messiah*—a glory given him by his Father—which Isaiah saw as a part of the vision described in the 6th chapter of his prophecy.

In allusion to John xx. 28, where Thomas says, "My Lord and my God," you remark, that "Unitarians prefer to let Thomas, in his alleged astonishment, or fright, fall into blasphemy, rather than receive his attestation." I do not know that I have met with a single Unitarian writer who regards these words merely as an unmeaning exclamation of surprise. Norton says, "Both

* "Αυτου, *his*, refers to God."—J. G. ROSENMULLER. "The pronoun *his* should be referred to *Lord* (namely *God*) in verse 38."—KUINOEL. (So BLOOMFIELD.) "Two manuscripts and a few versions have *the glory of God*, or *of his God*."—DR. ADAM CLARKE. *Concessions of Trinitarians*, pp. 184, 361.

titles, (that is, Lord and God,) I believe, were applied by Thomas to Jesus. But the name 'God' was employed by him, not as the proper name of the Deity, but as an appellative, according to a common use of it in his day; or perhaps in a figurative sense, as it sometimes occurs in modern writers." He then refers to several passages from Young, of which the following is one:—

"The death-bed of the just . . . . .
Is it his death-bed? No; it is his shrine:
Behold him there just rising to a God."

But all Trinitarians* do not consider this passage as proving the supreme divinity of Christ. KUINOEL says: "From this address of Thomas, many commentators are of opinion, that the doctrine of Christ's divine nature may be established, and conceive that the sentence, when filled up, would be thus: 'I am not faithless; I doubt no longer; thou art my Lord and my God.' But, on the contrary, *others justly observe,* that Thomas used the term God in the sense in which it is applied to *kings and judges,* who were considered as representatives of Deity, and pre-eminently to the Messiah. See Ps. lxxxii. 6, 7; xlv. 6, 7; cx. 1. John x. 35."

ROSENMULLER thus explains the passage: "I acknowledge thee as my Lord, and as the Messiah, my King."

MICHAELIS says: "I do not understand this as an address to Jesus; but thus, 'Yes; it is he indeed! He, my Lord and my God!' Yet, in giving this interpretation, I do not affirm that Thomas passed all at once from the extreme of doubt to the highest degree of faith, *and acknowledge Christ to be the true God.* This appears to me too much for the then existing knowledge of the disciples; and we have no intimation that they recognised the divine nature of Christ, before the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. I am therefore inclined to understand this expression, which broke out from Thomas in the height of his astonishment, in a figurative sense, denoting only 'whom I shall ever reverence in the highest degree.' If he only recollected what he had heard from the mouth of Jesus ten days before, (chapter xiv. 9, 10,) that recollection might have given occasion to an expression which probably Thomas himself could not have perfectly explained; as is often the case with such words as escape us when we are under the most overpowering surprise. But yet the expression might be equivalent to saying, 'He! my Lord! with whom God is most intimately united, and is in him! In whom I behold God, as it were, present before me.' Or, a person raised from the dead might be regarded as a divinity; for the word *God* is not always used in the strict doctrinal sense." All the above quotations are from *Concessions of Trinitarians,* pp. 383, 384.

* I have been informed by a gentleman whose critical attainments cannot be doubted, and who is likewise a Unitarian, that Kuinoel and Rosenmuller were neither of them Trinitarians. They were, he says, undoubtedly Arians. Their testimony, therefore, must be received by Trinitarians for just what, in their estimation, it is worth. Michaelis, however, is I believe, good Trinitarion authority.

Again, you allude in a more especial manner than before, to Phil. ii. 6, 7 and after requesting me to notice the expression, "took upon him," you ask, "is not the *him* a pre-existent, to whom another was added by way of assumption?" I reply, that *that* depends upon the sense you *give* to the succeeding words, "form of a servant,"—whether you mean to apply it to his *condition*, or to his *essential nature*. In regard to this point you say, "if the expression 'form of a servant' means, as it unquestionably does, a *real* servant, must not the former expression, 'form of God,' imply a *real* God?" And you ask, "what magic can unidentify Christ here, which will not, at the same time, and precisely in the same way, unhumanize him also?"

I have no idea that either of those expressions have any reference to a divine or a human *nature*, but merely, the one, to a condition of majesty and authority, and the other, to a condition of meanness and servility. That this is also the opinion of many Trinitarians, I can easily prove to you.

PISCATOR says: "By *the form of God* I do not think that the Apostle means the divine nature itself. . . . As, in the following verse, the phrase *form of a servant* signifies, not human nature itself, but a servile state or condition; so, by parity of reasoning, the expression *form of God* denotes, not the divine nature, but a divine state or condition."

"Jesus Christ," says LE CLERC, "as man, appeared, in certain respects, more like God than man, inasmuch as he commanded all nature with absolute authority, and performed unparalleled miracles. This the Apostle terms the *form*, that is, the resemblance of God: a sense in which the same word is used in verse 7, and in Mark xvi. 12."

"Nothing," says BEAUSOBRE "agrees better with this passage, than what the Evangelist says: 'Knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands' (this is *the form of God*,) 'he laid aside his garments, poured water into a basin, took a towel, and girded himself, and began to wash his disciples' feet' (this is *the form of a slave*.) John xiii. 3—5."

WHITBY, while he was a Trinitarian, thus commented on this passage: "By this expression most interpreters do understand, that the Apostle doth intend Christ was essentially and truly God; but though this be a certain truth, yet I conceive this cannot be the import of the expression in this place." And, according to Wilson, PARKHURST and MACKNIGHT "both deny taht the *form of God* indicates essence or nature, and, with Whitby, interpret the phrase as referring to the visible glorious light by which Christ manifested himself to the patriarchs."—*Concessions of Trinitarians*, pp. 477, 478.

Again, you refer me to 2 Pet. iii. 18. "To him be glory both now and for ever;" and you ask, "Can glory be given to any but God? or, if it can, can it, as to duration, be given *for ever* to any but him?" I answer, that I find, in several places in the New Testament, that glory *was* expressly given to Christ by his Father. Christ asserts that he is glorified in his followers; "All mine

are thine, and thine are mine, and I am glorified in them." He speaks of the "glory" which, says he, addressing his Father, "thou gavest me;" and in a prayer for his disciples, he says, "that they may behold my glory, *which thou hast given me.*" And shall not I *ascribe* glory to him, on whom God has so abundantly *bestowed* glory? And if I ascribe glory to him now, why should I not do it as long as my soul exists, which will be "for ever?" Why should I not, without believing him to be God himself be willing to say, "to him be glory both now and for ever?"

You call my attention, in the next place, to Heb. i. 6, "And let all the angels of God worship him;" and you inquire "when man is forbidden to worship angels, as in Rev. xxii. 8, 9, can angels be ordered to worship a *mere* man?" I answer, that this would be a startling passage, if the term "worship" were always used in the Bible in the same sense, and to denote supreme homage. But that it is frequently used in relation to subordinate homage or reverence, there can be no doubt. This passage, then, which, in itself considered, conveys a doubtful meaning, must be interpreted so as to harmonize with what is plain and undoubted. Now to me, it is plain that Christ has revealed himself, as a being distinct from and inferior to his Father, and therefore I conclude that God's "angels" or messengers, were only commanded to render him subordinate worship, or reverence.

In allusion to Col. i. 16, 17, you say, "even if we here admit, according to the Unitarian hypothesis, that Christ was God's agent in the creation of the terrestrial and celestial worlds, they are said to be made, not only 'by him,' but 'for him.'" But I do not understand the creation here spoken of to have any reference to the material worlds, but only to that spiritual creation, or to that new order of things which Christ came to introduce. See Letter XXIV. where the subject is more fully discussed.

NEW BOOKS.

A Catechism of the Old Testament: for the use of Families and Schools. By the Author of "A Catechism of the Life of Christ." London: Chapman, Brothers. Yarmouth: W. Alexander. 1846. p. 109.

We welcome this addition to our stock of Sunday-school books. Small in number as they necessarily are, it is refreshing when we find a new one suited to our wants. The one before us was especially needed. There is not a more difficult task for the teacher than that of giving the scholar a clear idea of the Patriarchal and Jewish history; and yet there has hitherto been no book of *moderate price* to aid him. To supply this desideratum has been the object of the writer of this Catechism; and well has that object been attained. It is concise, yet clear, and the useful information it contains on the productions of the East, and the manners and customs of the Jews, is so abundant, that we were surprised at finding so much in so small a compass. We commend the work to the attention of every Sunday-school teacher, and to the instructors of youth generally, as a useful manual of the Old Testament history.

POETRY.

GIVE THY HEART TO GOD ALONE!

When a thousand voices raise
To thy name the shout of praise,
And before thy dazzled sight
Glory beams enthroned in light,
While on thee she calls aloud,
Pointing to the admiring crowd,
Pause, nor kneel before her throne;
Give thy heart to God alone!

Sweeter strains of soft desire
Swell from Pleasure's golden lyre.
Bright as beams of opening day,
Hope and Transport round her play;
Smiles and Gaiety are there,
Banished far are Thought and Care.
Heed not thou the entrancing tone;
Give thy heart to God alone!

Mammon bids thee view the stone
Heaped for him from every shore.
Worship him, and wealth untold,
Through thy swelling coffers rolled,
Shall reward thy bended knee.—
Spurn the base idolatry!
Heavenly treasures are thine own;
Give thy heart to God alone!

Onward, in thy Saviour's path,
Brave the baffled Tempter's wrath.
Soon deceitful Pleasure's lay
From thine ear shall pass away;
Soon Ambition's thrilling voice
Cease to urge thy trembling choice.
Life's short day of duty done,
Thou shalt joy in God alone!

S. G. Bulfinch.

SPRING.

MEANWHILE the spring appeared. With an expression of God's love the sun smiled down upon the earth; she felt it, awoke from her sleep, and breathed out her morning prayer, in the silent but delicious fragrance of the fresh flowers. I would gladly know what goes on within you, O Earth! when thy birds begin to sing, thy waves to dance; when thou arrayest thyself in so beautiful a garment, that even under the shadows of night the stars of Heaven and the eyes of men look upon thee with love; when millions of small winged beings arise from thy flower-beds, and fill the air with the harmonious murmur of their gay existence; when a thrill of joy goes through their veins; when the whole inspired nature is a look of love and a hymn of gladness—I would gladly know if thou feelest the gladness which goes out from thee, the infinite delight which thou causest. What I know is, that thou givest new life to the heart of man, to his blood a quicker circulation; that thou deliverest his spirit from the oppressive grey winter of life; that, resting on the bosom of Nature, he can feel a joy independent of all things else, a pure feeling of love, of life, a love of living. O! that I could lead out whoever is sick in body or in mind on a spring morning; lay him among the young flowers; let him look up to the dark-blue sky; and in the bright and living splendour of the earth about him; let him feel the warmth of the sunbeams, the healing coolness of the air, all the sweet influences of life and of nature, which speak to the heart like the voice of a friend—like a smile from God. Certainly the unhappy man would forget for a time the ungrateful one who has injured him: forget the cares which are wasting away the threads of his life; even remorse would here be stilled, believing in forgiveness; the often deceived would hope anew; certainly the child of sorrow would, before his death, have a few hours of undisturbed felicity; when the evening comes he could still look back upon this spring morning and say, "I, too, have been happy upon the earth."

F. BREMER.

INTELLIGENCE.

GENERAL BAPTIST ACADEMY.—LONDON.

On Easter Sunday morning, a Sermon was preached at Worship-street Chapel, by the Rev. E. Kell, of Newport, Isle of Wight, in aid of the General Baptist Academy, under the care of the Rev. B. Mardon, as Theological Tutor. The text was appropriately taken form the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians xii. 29: "Are all Teachers?" And the preacher clearly showed that in the Apostle's opinion there were certain pre-requisites necessary for those who would become successful teachers of the Gospel; and if a certain amount of knowledge or aptness to teach, was desirable in the days when the power of working miracles was also frequently superadded, how much more was the need at the present time of a good education to prepare a minister for the due performance of his important office. Having established satisfactorily the importance of an efficient course of Academical instruction, the preacher glanced at

POETRY.

GIVE THY HEART TO GOD ALONE!

When a thousand voices raise
To thy name the shout of praise,
And before thy dazzled sight
Glory beams enthroned in light,
While on thee she calls aloud,
Pointing to the admiring crowd,
Pause, nor kneel before her throne;
Give thy heart to God alone!

Sweeter strains of soft desire
Swell from Pleasure's golden lyre.
Bright as beams of opening day,
Hope and Transport round her play;
Smiles and Gaiety are there,
Banished far are Thought and Care.
Heed not thou the entrancing tone;
Give thy heart to God alone!

Mammon bids thee view the stone
Heaped for him from every shore.
Worship him, and wealth untold,
Through thy swelling coffers rolled,
Shall reward thy bended knee.—
Spurn the base idolatry!
Heavenly treasures are thine own;
Give thy heart to God alone!

Onward, in thy Saviour's path,
Brave the baffled Tempter's wrath.
Soon deceitful Pleasure's lay
From thine ear shall pass away;
Soon Ambition's thrilling voice
Cease to urge thy trembling choice.
Life's short day of duty done,
Thou shalt joy in God alone!

S. G. Bulfinch.

SPRING.

MEANWHILE the spring appeared. With an expression of God's love the sun smiled down upon the earth; she felt it, awoke from her sleep, and breathed out her morning prayer, in the silent but delicious fragrance of the fresh flowers. I would gladly know what goes on within you, O Earth! when thy birds begin to sing, thy waves to dance; when thou arrayest thyself in so beautiful a garment, that even under the shadows of night the stars of Heaven and the eyes of men look upon thee with love; when millions of small winged beings arise from thy flower-beds, and fill the air with the harmonious murmur of their gay existence; when a thrill of joy goes through their veins; when the whole inspired nature is a look of love and a hymn of gladness—I would gladly know if thou feelest the gladness which goes out from thee, the infinite delight which thou causest. What I know is, that thou givest new life to the heart of man, to his blood a quicker circulation; that thou deliverest his spirit from the oppressive grey winter of life; that, resting on the bosom of Nature, he can feel a joy independent of all things else, a pure feeling of love, of life, a love of living. O! that I could lead out whoever is sick in body or in mind on a spring morning; lay him among the young flowers; let him look up to the dark-blue sky; and in the bright and living splendour of the earth about him; let him feel the warmth of the sunbeams, the healing coolness of the air, all the sweet influences of life and of nature, which speak to the heart like the voice of a friend—like a smile from God. Certainly the unhappy man would forget for a time the ungrateful one who has injured him: forget the cares which are wasting away the threads of his life; even remorse would here be stilled, believing in forgiveness; the often deceived would hope anew; certainly the child of sorrow would, before his death, have a few hours of undisturbed felicity; when the evening comes he could still look back upon this spring morning and say, "I, too, have been happy upon the earth."

F. BREMER.

INTELLIGENCE.

GENERAL BAPTIST ACADEMY.—LONDON.

On Easter Sunday morning, a Sermon was preached at Worship-street Chapel, by the Rev. E. Kell, of Newport, Isle of Wight, in aid of the General Baptist Academy, under the care of the Rev. B. Mardon, as Theological Tutor. The text was appropriately taken form the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians xii. 29: "Are all Teachers?" And the preacher clearly showed that in the Apostle's opinion there were certain pre-requisites necessary for those who would become successful teachers of the Gospel; and if a certain amount of knowledge or aptness to teach, was desirable in the days when the power of working miracles was also frequently superadded, how much more was the need at the present time of a good education to prepare a minister for the due performance of his important office. Having established satisfactorily the importance of an efficient course of Academical instruction, the preacher glanced at

education for eternity. Several other sentiments were proposed by the Chairman, and responded to by the Revs. P. Orr, J. Fullagar, and E. Tagart, Mr. Adams, Mr. Sheppard, &c., &c.

NOTTINGHAM.

At the annual meeting of the members and friends of the Fellowship Fund belonging to the High Pavement Chapel, Charles Paget, Esq., in the chair, various sums were voted to assist Chapels and useful Inststutions, including £5 to the Unitarian Association, £5 to the New Chapel at Montreal, Canada, £3 to the Manchester New College, £3 to Miriam's School, £5 to the Chapel at Yaxley, Huntingdonshire. Mr. Joseph Barker's presence added much to the evening's interest.

MARRIAGES.

On the 1st of April, at the General Baptist Chapel, Dover, by the Rev. J. L. Short, Mr. John P. Igglesdon, to Miss Rosanna Buckman.

On the 7th, at the Unitarian Chapel, Mead-row, Godalming, by the Rev. M. Davidson, John, eldest son of Mr. Isaac Ellis, of Artington, to Eliza, only daughter of Mr. James Ellis, of Littleton, Guildford.

On the 16th at the Unitarian Chapel, Bolton, by the Rev. F. Baker, M.A., Mr. Wm. Peat, to Mary Anne, daughter of Mr. John Pearson, Boston, Lincolnshire.

DEATHS.

On the 28th of March, aged 10 years, Herbert, second son of the Rev. James Martineau, of Park Nook, near Liverpool.

On the 12th of April, at Newcastle on Tyne, aged 47, the Rev. Joseph Mc. Alister, late pastor of the Congregation of Hanover-Square Chapel.

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The present number of the UNITARIAN appears at an increased price. We hope our friends will not object to this, as, in return, we have given twelve additional pages of letter-press. The future price will be Fourpence each number. We have been induced to do this, so as to give us the means of inserting the papers of our Correspondents entire.

"F.," "M. P.," "J. D. R.," and "J. L. S.," are thanked for their kind communications.

"F. W. K.'s" request cannot be complied with in the manner he wishes. If, however, he will call on our Publisher, No. 7, Farringdon Street, he may obtain all the information he requires.

"B. F.'s" favour came too late for insertion this month.

We have been reluctantly obliged to omit in the present number several papers prepared for insertion: among others, the tract "On Original Sin," by our esteemed friend, the Rev. W. Turner, Jun., and presume to hope he will excuse the omission; some particulars relating to Miriam's "Little Church and Home," at Walden, near Huddersfield, and those in reference to the History, Object, and Principles of the RAGGED SCHOOLS.

Our friend, Mr. C.'s notice of a Private School, will, we hope, bear with us another month.

*** Communications for the Editor to be addressed to the care of the Publisher, JOHN MARDON, No. 7, Farringdon Street, London.,